## Approved For Release 2000/08/07 : CIA-RDP96-00787R000500250020-0 UNCLASSIFIED

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF RANKINGS ASSIGNED TO SUBJECT RESPONSE PACKETS
ASSOCIATED WITH EACH TARGET

Matrix

| Transcript | Can Number |   |   |   |   |  |
|------------|------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| Letter     | 3          | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |
| А          | 1          | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 |  |
| В          | 5          | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 |  |
| С          | 3          | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |
| D          | 4          | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4 |  |
| E          | 2          | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |  |

## Analysis

| Experiment | Can | Target        | Rank of Assoc.<br>Packet |  |
|------------|-----|---------------|--------------------------|--|
| 1          | 4   | Spool and pin | 1                        |  |
| 2          | 7   | Leaf          | 1                        |  |
| 3          | 3   | Key ring      | 1                        |  |
| 4          | 8   | Sand          | 2                        |  |
| 5          | 9   | Quill         | 1                        |  |
| Т          | 6   |               |                          |  |
|            |     |               | p < 0.005                |  |

## Approved For Release 2000/08/03: SIA-REP96-00787R000500250020-0

"The five film cans with randomly numbered tops which contain objects constituted targets in five successive 'remote viewing' experiments. The subject's five response packets containing tape transcripts and associated drawings, one packet for each experiment, are to be matched to the film can contents. The response packets are unnumbered and presented in random order, so the matching is of the blind type; that is, no indication is being given as to which packet was generated in response to which target.

In carrying out the matching process, the judge must realize that the subject is instructed simply to give descriptive impressions as to the characteristics of a target, as opposed to trying to interpret or identify or name the target. This is based on the known fact that in psychoenergetic functioning, as in other subliminal perception processes, first impressions as to form, color and texture tend to be correct, but further efforts to analyze and interpret tend to lead to incorrect "analytical overlay." As an aid in judging with regard to this particular concept, we ask that as part of the judging exercise the judge should, before reading any subject transcript, examine all the targets, and write down for his own use a list of target descriptors (rather than names) for each item.

The details of the judging procedure, which involve filling in the accompanying matrix (see Table 1), are as follows. Select the lowest numbered can (Can No. 3) and examine its contents. Then read through the packets with the goal of determining best to worst description of this particular target. When the rank ordering is complete for this target, enter the rank order numbers, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, best to worst match, beside the appropriate transcript letter in the first column. Then examine the contents of Can No. 4, again ranking the packets best to worst match, and likewise enter the rank order numbers, 1-5, best to worst match, beside the appropriate transcript letter in the second column, and so on. The rank ordering for each target is to be done independently of the previous rank orderings, so that, for example, a given packet may be chosen first place match for more than one target if that provides the best ordering of descriptions. When the task is complete, the entire matrix should be filled in, at which time the packets are to be returned."

The objects in the first group of five consisted respectively of: a spool of thread with pin; a leaf; a small leatherbelt key ring with the letter "L" attached; sand; and a black and white quill (without feathers). The subject responses, briefly, were, respectively, a spool and pin, a rolled up something (spring?), a small leather belt with letter "L" or "F" attached, a beige-colored cylinder with rough edges, and a black and white pointed piece of plastic-like organic material. The judge's blind rank-order assessment, shown in Table 1, resulted in four 1st place and one 2nd place assignments, a